



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS

La Pensée italienne au XVI^e siècle et le courant libertin, par J.-ROGER CHARBONNEL, Paris, Champion, 1919. ix + A-UU + 720 + lxxxiv pp.

During the past quarter-century there has been a marked renaissance of interest in the literature of the French Renaissance as well as in that of the fifteenth century—two important periods of transition in French thought that had been largely neglected by students of both ancient and modern literature. Now that our knowledge of these epochs has been greatly augmented by monographs and other studies of a specialized nature, we are in a better position to understand their cultural background. And for a broad appreciation of the various literary movements, nothing is of greater importance than thorough investigations into the introduction or penetration of ideas from foreign countries. For example, Miss Le Duc, in her interesting dissertation on *Gontier Col and the French Pre-Renaissance*,¹ emphasized the role of diplomats and ambassadors in the dissemination of culture at the close of the fourteenth century and the beginning of the fifteenth. Again, M. Renaudet traced back to their sources the currents of thought that flowed mainly from the north. And now the present work approaches the subject from a somewhat similar point of vantage. In fact, this study, as its title indicates, is a history of ideas, especially in Italy, and their introduction into France. Its value is such that one can only wish that something similar may be done for other fields, such for instance as the history of the influence of the Church on French thought—a research that can be undertaken only by a scholar thoroughly familiar with medieval theology. It should consist of careful investigations of texts and documents of a widely varying nature, and not of the cursory and incomplete sketch so characteristic of contributions of this kind, some of which unfortunately only serve to give us false impressions. And just as the splendid study of M. Charbonnel will, if not revolutionize, at least help us to revise our conception of the trend of thought in the

¹Lancaster, Pa., 1918.

seventeenth century, so a work of the type mentioned above will enable us to acquire a far more accurate understanding than we perhaps possess at present of the great epoch which we imperfectly designate as the Dark Ages.

One of the outstanding facts that impress us on approaching the study of the Renaissance in France is the remarkable open mindedness and desire for knowledge manifested by the leading thinkers of that important period. How eagerly they welcomed new ideas! Du Bellay and Peletier were seeking out new paths in poetry and prosody; Meigret, Peletier, and others were attempting to solve problems in language and orthography in quite the same spirit and manner that phoneticians and philologists are trying to apply at present; Bodin, L'Hospital, La Boëtie and their co-workers sought to introduce new ideas and methods in government and politics; Rabelais and Montaigne and their disciples and rivals took up questions relating to education and science; Le Fèvre d'Étaples, Calvin (notwithstanding his later dogmatism) and many others turned to religion; and the list might be continued for other lines, such as art, architecture, medicine, astronomy, etc. "L'âge moderne et le siècle de Montaigne, de Pomponazzi, de Bruno, se peuvent rapprocher l'un de l'autre," says M. Charbonnel (p. D). Indeed, this was the century in which thought was to a great extent freed from the trammels that hampered its development in other periods—it was an epoch of transition, in which the vogue of old authorities was shattered, and new ones, whose establishment was largely due to the growth of absolutism, were not yet accepted. At no time in history was the intellectual relationship between France and neighboring countries so intimate, and this condition doubtless was at once the cause and the effect of the widespread interest in foreign travel.

Thanks to these pilgrims, most of whom were scholars, new currents of ideas penetrated into France.² And this "confluent," as M. Charbonnel aptly applies a term which is justified by the way in which neo-Platonism, mysticism, Petrarchism and even Aristotelianism became intermingled, served as a new "tournant," or

² For a list of Frenchmen who studied at the University of Ferrara in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, cf. Picot, *Étudiants français à l'Université de Ferrare* in the *Journal des Savants*, Feb., 1902. Naudé, an arch-libertine of the seventeenth century, took his doctoral degree at Padua in 1633.

point of departure, for a rejuvenation of thought. It is therefore obvious that the origins, as well as the principles, of classicism, which, according to M. Charbonnel, are still "mal systématisés," need, as a consequence of his investigations, further elucidation. Until recently even the overwhelming influence of Italy on the Renaissance in France had not been sufficiently appreciated.³ The Libertine movement likewise, which has often been considered as confined to seventeenth-century France, extends its roots far back into the preceding period—most probably as far back as to the positive attitude assumed by the Church in favor of Thomism. It seems, as a matter of fact, to have been this dogmatic exclusiveness that stirred hostile thought.⁴ Hence it will be necessary for us to modify to a great extent our acquiescence in the assumption of M. Strowski that the breviary of the Libertines in the seventeenth century was the *Sagesse* of Charron.⁵ As stated above.

³ Works by Picot, Villey, Vianey, Tilley, Renaudet, and others have contributed for the most part to a more just evaluation of the influence of France's southern neighbor.

⁴ The reader's attention should be called to the somewhat unusual method of pagination adopted by M. Charbonnel. For example, to the end of the *Table des Matières*, Italic capitals (I-IX) are used. For the preface and bibliography Roman capitals (A-UU) have been adopted. In the appendices the ordinary Roman lettering (i-lxxxiv) has been selected.

A usual failing of French scholars to which M. Charbonnel also falls a victim is the tendency to distort English names and mis-spell English words. Thus, French scholars persist—for unknown reasons—in calling Mr. Christie, Mr. Copley Christie (p. DD); and the familiar name of McIntyre appears as Intyre (Mac) (p. SS). Furthermore, we find 'skeptis' on p. MM—but corrected on p. TT—in which one would possibly not recognize 'sceptics.' Nouns and adjectives of nationality are often not capitalized, as, e. g., *italian* (p. LL), etc.

It may also be noted that the author seems to have failed to explain the abbreviations used in the bibliography (pp. O-UU), which in other respects is most satisfactory. The only omissions found by the reviewer are Renaudet, *Préréforme et humanisme à Paris, pendant les premières guerres d'Italie*, Paris, 1916; A. Tilley, *The Dawn of the French Renaissance*, Cambridge, 1918; and Alma de L. Le Duc, *Gontier Col and the French Pre-Renaissance*, Lancaster, Pa., 1918. But it is quite possible that all of these works appeared after M. Charbonnel had completed his ms. In the reviewer's opinion, M. C. deserves credit for having emphasized the importance of the *Doctrine Curieuse* of Père Garasse. If judged in a negative way, it is valuable for its information regarding the different Libertine movements.

⁵ In fact, the main weakness of M. Strowski's otherwise useful *Pascal et*

Libertinism goes even back of and beyond the paganism of the Pléiade. And, strangely enough, by its unswerving devotion to Aristotle, the Church encouraged the very forces which it was seeking to destroy.⁶ In the sixteenth century a great impetus was given to the Libertine movement by the publication of the translation of the *Cortegiano* of Castiglione,⁷ which, with the *Amadis de Gaule*, had such extraordinary influence on the development of social ideals in France. Furthermore, with the influx of Italians at the French court—due in the early period to Francis I and later on to Catherine de Médicis⁸—the diffusion of Libertine ideas was very great. La Noue, in his *Discours*, states that in 1585 there were one million atheists and unbelievers in France. In order to set forth clearly the ultimate sources of Libertinism, M. Charbonnel finds it desirable to give succinct résumés of the philosophy of Plato, Aristotle and the neo-Platonists, and then shows, as mentioned above, how all of these schools became more or less intermingled and confused at the time of the Renaissance (p. 160).

son temps (3 vols., Paris, 1907) consists in his tendency to arrive at definite and far-reaching conclusions from insufficient data—generalizations not seldom influenced by preconceived hypotheses, against which the reader must be carefully on his guard. Thus, M. Villey in his brilliant study entitled *Les Sources et l'évolution des Essais de Montaigne*, (Paris, 1908) has shown that M. Strowski was also wrong in insisting on the influence of Pico della Mirandola on Montaigne (cf. Strowski, *Montaigne et F. Pic de la Mirandole*, Bulletin italien, 1905; and *Montaigne*, Paris, 1906).

⁶ This may serve to explain why, in spite of the vigorous anti-scholasticism of the sixteenth century, Aristotle maintained his sway over the philosophy of the seventeenth century (cf. Charbonnel, pp. 38 and 48). Moreover, notwithstanding the almost universal condemnation of Machiavelli, the development of absolutism under Louis XIV—of which the sources may be found in the instruction of his tutor Mazarin—may also be due in large part to the cult of the Greek philosopher (p. 15).

⁷ Translated by Jacques Colin d'Auxerre and edited by Mellin de Saint-Gelays in 1538. Cf. H.-J. Molinier, *Mellin de Saint-Gelays*, Rodez, 1910, pp. 145-148.

⁸ It is interesting to note that, following Agrippa d'Aubigné, M. Charbonnel attributes the astuteness and cruelty of Catherine to the influence of Machiavelli (p. 34). But, as indicated above, it was through the popularity of Aristotle that Libertinism was fostered. So much so that whenever it was discovered that a heretic was an Aristotelian, no special objection was raised against him. In that respect M. Charbonnel quotes freely (pp. 80 et seq.) from a splendid appreciation of Aristotle by Silhon, one of the publicists of Richelieu, in his *De l'Immortalité de l'âme*.

Next follow (p. 160) expositions of the doctrines of Ibn-Roschd (1126-1198)—better known as Averroës, St. Thomas (p. 172), and the Astrologers (p. 192), after which the author makes it apparent (p. 244 et seq.) that the Church seemed to be disturbed only when the immortality of the soul was brought into question, for, on account of the prevalence of Epicureanism, this dogma was looked upon by theologians as the keystone of orthodoxy.⁹

In what may be considered the most important chapters of this volume, M. Charbonnel has revealed his critical acumen in stressing the influence of the brilliant, though erratic, Italian philosopher Lucilio Vanini (p. 302). It is quite true that in the *Histoire critique de la vie de Jules-César Vanini*,¹⁰ M. Baudouin has given a careful estimate of the contribution of the Neapolitan to the history of philosophy, which after all is not important, but though he has been mentioned frequently by literary critics, no one seems to have attempted a clear statement of his influence on the cultural background of the seventeenth century. And yet there is little doubt that this popularizer did more to mould liberal thought than any other person of his time. In fact, to understand Gassendi and the Libertine movement, it is necessary to study Vanini, for, as we have already indicated, the wide acceptance of these doctrines was in a way a natural consequence of propaganda by Italians. One feels, therefore, that no student of this epoch, after reading M. Charbonnel's résumés and translations of the tracts of the brilliant Neapolitan, will fail to give him his just deserts.¹¹

* Thereby much of the seeming lack of consistency on the part of the Church—such as persecution of philosophers and scholars like Dolet and Ramus, while ardent Aristotelians and heretical poets were allowed to go scot free—becomes not only explicable but consequential. The course pursued by the Jesuits, which M. C. has analyzed so thoroughly (p. 273), falls in line with what is stated above.

¹⁰ *Revue philosophique*, III, 1879; republished in one volume in 1903, and also reprinted in the *Revue des Pyrénées*, xv, 1903.

¹¹ A reading of Vanini's treatises helps us to understand why Aristotle continued to exercise undisputed sway over the theological philosophy of the seventeenth century (cf. p. 323). See also Vanini's theory regarding the immortality of the soul (p. 324). For Platonism in Vanini, cf. p. 336. M. Charbonnel deserves our thanks for having translated several of the important tracts of the Italian philosopher in view of the fact that his works are now difficult to obtain. For the same reason it is perhaps only right that the greatest amount of space should be allotted to an author who after all is merely a vulgarizer (86 pp.).

In regard to the frightful penalty inflicted upon Vanini, it may not be out of place to recall that his prosecutor was Guillaume de Catel, the justly celebrated historian of Toulouse.¹² Anent the conduct of the trial, the present reviewer may be justified in quoting a few lines from an article published by him a few years ago relating to a letter written by Catel to the renowned Peiresc:

“Les registres des Capitouls [of Toulouse] et les mémoires du temps, ainsi que ceux de nos jours, ont accusé le savant historien d’avoir mis une âpreté indomptable à arracher au Parlement cet arrêt de condamnation. Pour expliquer ce prétendu acharnement, on a supposé une romanesque rivalité d’amour. On a même affirmé que Catel aurait voulu se venger de Vanini, et plusieurs savants auraient jugée digne de foi cette légende invraisemblable. Mais s’il y eut du parti pris de la part de Catel, ce n’est pas là qu’il faut en chercher les motifs. Dans un article sur le testament de Catel, Mgr. Douais a parlé avec éloge de ‘la vraie bonté d’âme’ dont l’historien fit preuve envers tous ceux qui l’entouraient, sa famille, ces amis et même ses domestiques. Les nombreuses donations faites par lui aux pauvres et aux institutions charitables de Toulouse établissent que sa foi était ardente et sincère. Or, ainsi que ses concitoyens, il a dû partager l’intolérance et les préjugés de son époque. A Toulouse, a-t-on dit, on n’a jamais cessé de poursuivre les incroyants et les athées. Cinq ans à peine avant le procès de Vanini, les collègues de Catel avaient condamné au même supplice le prêtre Jean Duval, accusé de magie. C’est plutôt donc du côté religieux qu’il faut nous tourner pour retrouver les motifs de la rigueur de Catel contre le Napolitain; et le postscriptum de la présente lettre nous paraît pouvoir servir d’appui à notre thèse.”¹³

This brief postscript, containing the only mention ever made by Catel of his victim, shows that, notwithstanding his rôle as prosecutor, the learned historian and lawyer came under the spell of the brilliant Italian philosopher and was not sparing in words of praise for his erudition. One must not forget that Catel was unaware of the fact that Ponipée Lucilio and Lucilio Vanini were one and the same person; and his brief remarks on this occasion have, therefore, even greater weight. The postscript reads as follows:

“Si ma lettre ne estoit si longue, je vous fairoes le discours d’un insigne athée, philosophe, et médecin, fils de Naples; lequel a esté sur mon raport par les deux chambres condamné et brûlé. Il est mort athée, persévérant tousjours, le plus beau et le plus méchant esprit que je aye cogneu. Son nom estoet Pompée Lucilio.”

Because of our general ignorance of the extensive Latin literature of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, we usually fail to take into consideration its important part in the history of French cul-

¹² He was the author of the *Histoire des contes de Tolose* (Toulouse, 1623, fol.), and the *Mémoires de l’histoire du Languedoc* (Toulouse, 1633, fol.).

¹³ *Une lettre de Guillaume de Catel à Peiresc* in *Les Annales du Midi*, XVIII, 1906, pp. 351-357.

ture. Practically all of the intellectual élite were skilled in Latin, to which vehicle, notwithstanding the somewhat verbose and futile declarations of Du Bellay, were consigned their most profound ideas. Hence by limiting our attention, as is customary, to French works alone, we miss what is probably most significant in the thought of the period. The vigorous and well-sustained logic of Vanini, as shown especially in the quotation on p. 352, is not only a splendid specimen of his style, but makes us regret our indifference—if we have been indifferent—to the work of these scholars. Furthermore, that we are dealing with a spirit totally at variance with that of the Church is obvious from the fact that these philosophers reject with scorn the idea of the “faibles d’esprit” so dear to the theologian, and acclaim loudly “la passion pour la gloire,” the dynamic principle of the Renaissance (p. 356).

Regarding Machiavelli, M. Charbonnel assumes the customary point of view, that his great work *Il Principe* was not intended as a satire but rather as a vigorous protestation against the debilitating influence of Catholicism.¹⁴ Likewise the position occupied by Archimedes in the evolution of thought in these two centuries has been largely underestimated, although he was highly appreciated by scholars who, like Leonardo, were surfeited with the endless syllogisms of the scholastics. But more attention might have been accorded to Nicholas de Cusa (1401-1464). As the author of the *De Docta Ignorantia*, *De Visione Dei*, *De Concordantia Cathedræ*, he serves as a connecting link between the German mystics of the fourteenth century and the Italian neo-Platonists of the succeeding period, and thereby plays an important part in the promotion of independent thought.

Then follow succinct as well as comprehensive outlines of the philosophical ideas of Leonardo da Vinci and Giordano Bruno.¹⁵ In regard to the latter we should not fail to note how greatly he was influenced by the neo-Platonism of his time—a fact that has not heretofore been emphasized (pp. 527-529).

¹⁴ Cf. pp. 410 and 422. For his influence on political theory in modern Germany, see p. 435.

¹⁵ The author supplies in the notes extensive translations and quotations from the original texts as well as other material, all of which enables the reader to make his own verifications and to control the conclusions presented.

Next in order may be found expositions of the fundamental principles of the philosophy of Kepler (p. 565), Galileo (p. 567) and Campanella (p. 574), in whose work also traces of neo-Platonism are manifest—a further testimony to the popularity of the author of the *Banquet*. In fact, if Aristotle was the patron saint of the scholastics, practically all of those outside the chosen circle came more or less under the spell of the exponent of love. Even the philosophy of the eighteenth century, notwithstanding its materialistic tendencies, is far more imbued with his doctrines than one is usually inclined to believe.¹⁶

After repeating (p. 703) that the *Pensées* of Pascal represent mainly a defense of Christianity against the insidious attacks of Libertinism, M. Charbonnel brings his masterly work to a close.¹⁷

In conclusion, if Libertinism assumed a decidedly transalpine character toward the close of the sixteenth century, a perusal of this work will show that it was not exotic to France. As a matter of fact, it was essentially Gallic—a heritage of the Middle Ages. Its immediate precursor—if that term may be used—was in all probability the *esprit narquois* of the *sotties* and *fabliaux* reappearing in the form of Lucianism during the closing years of the fifteenth century. But, unlike the authors of these works—for example Gringore—who by virtue of being regarded as defenders of the public weal, enjoyed great popularity, the Libertine, because he was not, as a general rule, animated by a lofty spirit, failed to win any large measure of esteem. And this was so true that even when he was a victim of atrocious punishment (as in the case of Vanini), his sad fate elicited little sympathy. Like the clever

¹⁶ Cf. pp. 592-593. The reader is also referred to the résumés of the philosophy of Voltaire (p. 688), Diderot (p. 694) and the three Impostors (p. 696).

¹⁷ There follow several excellent and carefully prepared appendices. It is to be regretted that in the one entitled *Relations intellectuelles entre l'Italie et la France* the author did not make greater use of the study by Emile Picot mentioned frequently above, as well as of the list of French authors and scholars who traveled in Italy in the early sixteenth century (published by M. H. Chamard in the *Revue des cours et conférences*, Paris, 1914, xxii, p. 527), which, though far from complete, is extremely useful.

Numerous omissions from the *Table onomastique* will greatly impair the usefulness of this study as a work of reference. So important a contribution should be made accessible to all by a fuller index as well as a more satisfactory *Table des matières*.

paragrapher of the present day who sacrifices everything to brilliance of wit, his criticism was negative and thereby, most frequently, destructive. Indeed, it was in the period when the spirit of vigorous protestation that animated the past was at its lowest ebb that Libertinism flourished most freely. Briefly, it may be characterized as a kind of decadent opposition to the outspreading and overtowering absolutism of the Church of the seventeenth century. It was a philosophical dilettanteism that had infected all the upper classes of society. During the course of the following century, when the somnolent populace began to re-assert itself, it was doomed to a gradual downfall.

JOHN L. GERIG.

Columbia University.

Die Frauen rings um Friedrich Hebbel. Neue Materialien zu ihrer Erkenntnis. Mit einem Anhang: Aus Hebbels Freundeskreis. Von ALBRECHT JANSSEN. Hebbel-Forschungen VIII. Berlin-Leipzig, 1919. xi + 144 pp.

Certainly the most striking part of this little book is the evidence it brings forward in support of the view that Friedrich Hebbel was the illegitimate son of a Pastor Volekmar, the same man to whom Werner refers as Volckmann, a popular version of the name. The editor of the series (*Hebbel-Forschungen*), while not considering the evidence compelling, does consider it worthy of attention. Even the author, though evidently much in love with his theory, does not claim to have established it conclusively.

Briefly the evidence is as follows. The rumor that Hebbel was Volckmar's son was generally current in Wessalburen from the poet's boyhood days on. After Bamberg came into possession of Hebbel's *Nachlass*, he wrote (1882) to Hugo Schlömer in Wessalburen, as a native of that place interested in founding a committee for the purpose of perpetuating the poet's memory, requesting him to find out what he could about Volekmar, "da angenommen werden müsse, dass dieser der natürliche Vater Hebbels gewesen sei." This letter from Bamberg was lost by the recipient, though his reply referring to the matter, dated 28. 8. 1882, is in Janssen's possession. The fact that Bamberg had dignified the "rumor" by his serious attention, though the investigation had no definite